

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,651	03/30/2001	Scott J. Tuman	54407USA6B.006	9447
32692 75	590 05/18/2004		EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			TSOY, ELENA	
PO BOX 33427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			1762	I AI EK NOMBEK

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/822,651	SEIDEL ET AL.			
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Elena Tsoy	1762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 23 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	÷			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);				
<ul> <li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without cancelli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· / /				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:	•	•			
Claim(s) objected to:	•				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>21-48, 50-70</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10. Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/822,651

Art Unit: 1762

## **Advisory Action**

1. Request for Reconsideration filed on April 23, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the final rejection has been entered and considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance.

## Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicants' arguments filed April 23, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- (A) Applicants argue that claimed invention is novel over Thomas because (i) in case of hook structures 44, Figures 1 and 2 clearly show a demarcation line between each base of adjacent hook structures 44; and (ii) in case of an array of loops attached to a substrate, each individual loop is attached to the substrate 24 by a base 26 so that each "discrete polymeric region" provides only a single loop, and, even if one were to consider a row of adjacent loop components the equivalent of the claimed "discrete polymeric region", the loop components form only loops, not stems.
- As to (i), the Examiner agrees with Applicants' argument that because of the demarcation line between each base of adjacent hook structures 44 hook structures 44 do not form claimed "discrete polymeric regions".

As to (ii), a row of adjacent loop components does form claimed "discrete polymeric regions" with a plurality of loop stems 28 extending from each "discrete polymeric region". Since Applicants did not define "stem", and a word "stem" can be interpreted according to

Application/Control Number: 09/822,651

Art Unit: 1762

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, as "something held to resemble a plant stem", loop stems 28 clearly cover claimed stems.

(B) Applicants argue that claimed invention is novel over Wessels et al because in contrast to claimed invention, a resin, which forms hook elements, *encapsulates* the substrate instead of being fused *to* a first major side of the web.

First of all, Figures 4A-4F of Wessels et al do <u>not</u> show that resin, which forms hook elements, *encapsulates* the substrate. As admitted by Applicants, the resin passes through the pores of woven or knit cloth to embed the foundation structure of the woven or knit cloth (See column 4, lines 18-20).

Secondly, claims do <u>not</u> recite <u>negative</u> limitation that polymer should <u>not</u> embed or encapsulate a substrate web while fusing discrete polymeric regions.

Thirdly, it is the Examiner's position that in claimed invention, a polymer of polymeric regions also embeds or encapsulates (at least partially) a <u>fibrous</u> web of claim 24, <u>porous</u> web of claim 25, <u>woven</u> web of claim 26 or a <u>knit</u> web of claim 28 while *fusing* a polymeric region to the web.

## Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy whose telephone number is (571) 272-1429. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo-Thur. 9:00-7:30.

Application/Control Number: 09/822,651

Art Unit: 1762

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (571) 272-1415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elsoy

Elena Tsoy Examiner Art Unit 1762

May 12, 2004